

[Draft for Getty seminar, not for publication.]

## **Pompeian identities: between Oscan, Samnite, Greek, Roman and Punic**

**Andrew Wallace-Hadrill**

Pompeii is a welcoming place for thinking about the complexities of cultural identity: because it is a frontier zone (but then, what zone is not a frontier?). Of course, Pompeii has long had to do duty for some sort of standard 'Roman' city. That it was 'Roman' from its establishment as a colony, in a year not precisely known, but normally taken to be 80 BCE, is undeniable; the assumed corollary is that before that point, it was not Roman, but as Amedeo Maiuri put it, 'pre-Roman' (Maiuri 1973). Such contrasts do less than justice to the subtleties of cultural identity, and Pompeii was a good deal more 'Roman' before it became a colony than is generally allowed, and perhaps rather less 'Roman' than generally allowed thereafter. In what follows, I shall start by looking at Strabo's account of the ethnic identities of Pompeii and the surrounding area; and then take two moments, of 'Etruscan' Pompeii in the sixth century, and 'Hellenistic' Pompeii in the second century, to illustrate the complexity of the town's cultural identities.

### **Strabo's Pompeii**

The bay of Naples is familiar as a hinge zone between Greek colonists and local Italian powers, an enclave of non-Greekness (Etruscan, Samnite) caught between the solid block of colonized coast up to Posidonia, and the final bastion of colonial power represented by the northern coast from Neapolis to Cumae. From the sea, it is completely exposed to the Greek; but to the south it is shielded by the massive limestone outcrop of the Monti Lattari, which connects it strongly to the hinterland of Irpinia. Those who lived in Pompeii necessarily had relations with both their Greek and their Irpinian neighbours, at all periods. What varies through time, is the strength of presence of the outsiders from central Italy, whether Etruscans or Romans.

Strabo, as is well-known, regarded the histories of both Herculaneum and Pompeii as marked by successive waves of domination:

The Oscans held both (Herculaneum) and the next settlement, Pompeii, past which flows the river Sarnus, then the Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians, and after that the Samnites; these too fell from these places. (5.4.8)

This account is generally simplified into the sequence, Oscan, Etruscan, Samnite, Roman, so disposing of the rather awkward Pelasgians (Briquel 1984). Strabo's sequence evidently belongs to

a tradition of Greek historiography, which he cites at greater length when introducing Campania (5.4.3): here he contrasts the account of Antiochus of Syracuse, who said that Campania was once held by the Opici, also called the Ausones, with that of Polybius, who said that both Opici and Ausones lived around the crater. He then cites nameless others, who say that after Opici and Ausones came in succession the Oscan Sidicini, the Cumaei and the Tyrrheni, and he goes on to mention the foundation of 12 Etruscan cities with Capua as their capital. This is not so much a succession of tribes who inhabited Campania as an account of the shifting centres of domination, from the Oscan Teanum Sidicinum to the Greek Cumae to the Etruscan Capua. But since in this account the Etruscans cede control to the Samnites, who in turn cede control to the Romans, there is substantial overlap with the more local sequence for Pompeii and Herculaneum, with the exception that the Opici are passed over in the account of Pompeii and Herculaneum, that these settlements lack a phase of Greek domination, while the mysterious Pelasgians appear only for Pompeii and Herculaneum not in the account of Campania.

Strabo's account, ignoring for a moment its historical accuracy, also says something about the cultural self-definition of the area in the late first century BCE. Both Campania more broadly, and Pompeii and Herculaneum in particular, might think of themselves as having a cultural stratigraphy: if they were 'Roman' now, they knew that in the past they had been subject to different influences, Samnite, Greek, Etruscan, Oscan, not to speak of tribes lost in the mist of time, Opici, Ausones, Pelasgians or whatever. Moreover, this self-perception (assuming they would have accepted Strabo's account of them) was by no means purist. Strabo's awareness of overlap is most explicit in his account of Neapolis. It was a city of the Cumaeans, but recolonised as the New City by the Calchidians, in consort with the Pithecousseans and Athenians. On top of this collaborative complexity, there was an element of Campanians in their make-up, admitted in crisis on the advice of Delphi, so converting their worst enemies to their best friends. Strabo is not being a mere antiquarian: he wants to drive home the point about racial mixtures, and points out that if you look at the names of their demarchs, the earliest are Greek only, whereas later they are Greek mixed with Campanian. And not content with this Greek/Campanian mix, he points out that Naples is still a cultural mix-up: many traces of Greek culture are preserved there, *gymnasia*, *ephebeia* etc though the people are now Roman. Nor will he leave alone the point that cultures overlap and are superimposed. He goes on to elaborate that the motives of people who chose to retire to the area from Rome are precisely to enjoy these Greek cultural elements. He knows, that is to say, that earlier cultural layers may survive not merely because elements of the earlier populations survive, but because the cultural mixture is in itself a draw to new immigrants (5.4.7-8).

Read in this light, Strabo may be suggesting to us not merely that we should expect to find different cultures at different points of the Pompeian past, Oscan, Etruscan, Samnite and Roman, but that one of the cultural characteristics of the city is the complexity of its ethnic history, and that we might expect to see these differences simultaneously present in the now of Pompeii. Anybody who strolled at the end of the first century BCE, as indeed in 79 CE, might expect to encounter the surviving traces of the phases, the archaic temple of Athena/Hercules of the triangular forum, the once-archaic temple of Apollo by the Forum with its second-century remodelling and Oscan inscriptions, indeed Oscan inscriptions mixed with Roman ones throughout the major public buildings of the town like the Basilica, the Stabian baths and the theatre. How could a late first-century Pompeian make sense of his city to a visitor without this ‘peu d’histoire’? Let us spool back and ask how it would have seemed at two earlier points, the end of the sixth c. BCE, and the middle of the second century.

### **Archaic Pompeii**

We are considerably better informed about early Pompeii than (say) 10 years ago, thanks to the last decade’s outbreak of subsurface excavations in Pompeii (for an snapshot of different positions, Guzzo and Guidobaldi 2005 and forthcoming). This is thanks in large measure to the current management’s desire to involve foreign and Italian Universities in new research into Pompeii, without extending the excavated surface of the site: hence the series of excavations to explore the earlier history of the site by several Italian teams (notably those of Carandini and Coarelli), by two British teams (BSR with Reading, and the Bradford-based Anglo-American team), two German teams under the DAI (Pirson/Dickmann and Seiler), and an array of Dutch, Finnish, Swedish and others. One point has become abundantly clear. While Amedeo Maiuri had conducted a series of soundings in the period of 1920s, 30s and 40s within what had been hypothesised as the ‘old city’, the Altstadt characterised by irregular layout and a circuit around the forum, and had repeatedly found a combination of wall footings in the soft local volcanic tuff called ‘pappamonte’ with Etruscan bucchero pottery, and had concluded that the old town must indeed belong to the sixth century and earlier, the new excavations have tended to replicate his findings more widely, suggesting that the archaic city was a good deal more substantial than imagined. What can we say now of its cultural make-up?

Of one point we can be reasonably confident: that it was not a Greek colonial foundation. This has always been clear from the literary tradition: because it is a characteristic of Greek colonial

foundations to recite their foundation histories, with critical information about mother-cities and founders, it seems extremely unlikely that local knowledge could have become so warped by Strabo's day as to go into denial about this background. Part of their self-knowledge was that while Cumae and Neapolis were Greek cities, at least in origin, Pompeii and Herculaneum (let alone Nola or Nuceria) were not. But the material culture of early Pompeii has long created a difficulty for the projection of Pompeii as a not-Greek city. Above all, attention has long been drawn to the fact that the two known temples of the early city were dedicated precisely to the divinities most cultivated by the Greek colonists: Apollo and Athena (with Hercules). Maiuri excavated the votive deposits of the temple of Apollo, and found ample deposits of archaic Greek pottery, albeit mixed up with plenty of Etruscan bucchero, with a handful of graffiti in Etruscan script.

For Maiuri, this evidence was contradictory, but he brought it to bear ingeniously on a long-standing debate about whether early Pompeii was Greek or Etruscan (Maiuri 1973, 135-60). He saw that dedications in Etruscan, even in a Greek-style temple, indicated an Etruscan presence in the town; but he refused to believe that Etruscans could be responsible for a temple to Apollo, which so clearly pointed to the influence of Cumae.<sup>1</sup> He also drew attention to the contrast between the irregular layout of the Altstadt, which he attributed to the local Oscan population, and the regular grid layout of Region VI. He felt confident that neither the Etruscans nor the Samnites 'from their rough crags in the Appennines' could have introduced such sophisticated urban planning.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Maiuri, in the light of excavations at Salerno, especially at the necropolis of Fratte, accepted that the idea of a period of Etruscan dominance in Campania must be right. His way out was to limit Etruscan influence at Pompeii to the crucial period between the battle of Aristodemus of Cumae of 524 and the defeat of the Etruscans by Hiero of Syracuse in 474. By limiting Etruscan dominance to a 50-year period, he could argue that all the elements that seemed Greek, the temples and the urban layout, took place under direct Greek influence.

Since Maiuri, of course, a good deal more evidence has emerged about the strength and duration of Etruscan presence in Campania. Cristophani (1992) had no hesitation in characterising the foundation and early years of Pompeii as Etruscan. He noted that the mixture of Greek and Etruscan pottery from the temple of Apollo, published in the mean time by De Caro (1986), 'non appare sufficiente a caratterizzare in senso greco o etrusco i devoti'. Well could one ask how many

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Par quasi assurdo pensare che sulla coste della Campania, nell'ambito dell'impero marittimo di Cuma, prima propagatrice del culto apollineo a Roma e fra gli Etruschi del Lazio e dell'Etruria... dovesse essere quel culto introdotto a Pompei degli Etruschi!' (Maiuri 1973, 149)

<sup>2</sup> 'E' inverosimile che i Sanniti, dalle loro aspre rocche dell'Appennino, recassero una tale esperienza e una tale esigenza e che l'applicassero per la prima volta a Pompei.' (Maiuri 1973, 153)

imported Greek or Etruscan) pots it would take to make the inhabitants Greek or Etruscan. Far more revealingly, he observes that the mixture is very much than of Lavinium, Rome, Veii or Pyrgi of the same period. The same mixed material culture characterises true Etruscan settlements (Veii and Pyrgi) as Latin settlements under Etruscan influence (Rome, Lavinium). It is not that revealing about ethnicity. Like Maiuri, Cristophani found the conclusive evidence to be the Etruscan graffiti, and suggested that Pompeii was like Pontecagnano (Salerno) in maintaining its Etruscophone element into the fourth century.

Jos De Waele returned to the Etruscan versus Greek debate in his publication of the ‘Doric’ temple of Athena of the triangular forum (de Waele 2001, 127-32). He noted the persistency of the assumption that a temple with a classic Greek plan, with Doric capitals close to those of Paestum, and terracottas in the best Greek manner, could only be constructed by the Greeks. So in 1904, Mau objected to the thesis of an Etruscan Pompeii: ‘Aber wenn Pompeji von 800 bis gegen 400 etruskisch war, wie konnte im 6.Jh. der grossgriechische Tempel auf dem Forum Triangulare entstehen?’ Similarly Carrington in 1932: ‘The important point is that when the Oscans of Pompeii carried out a work under Greek influence, they came under that influence completely. There were no half measures: the temple was purely Greek.’ De Waele takes some pleasure in arguing that on the contrary, the temple plan is not compatible with any known Greek temple, and that the real parallels are with the Etrusco-Italic tradition, as at Satricum.

But if Mau and Carrington were pushing too hard for Greek purity, De Waele in his turn may be pushing too hard for the Etrusco-Italic to be a distinct tradition. Coarelli had already cautioned against the ‘radical dehistoricisation’ of contrasting the peripteral Greek temple with the frontal Etrusco-Italic temple (Coarelli 1996, 18-19). He pointed out that the earliest Italic temples known, those of Pyrgi and Satricum, were precisely variants on the peripteral Greek temple. The distinction is not innate, but emerges gradually. That is to say, Oscan Pompeii was trying to be Greek in the same sort of way that Latin Satricum or Etruscan Pyrgi were trying to be Greek; and in the same way, the dedications in the temple of Apollo had the same sort of mix-up of Greek imports and local Italian productions (which were in turn imitating Greek imports) as did Etruscan Pyrgi or Veii, or Latin Lavinium or Rome. Similarly, the terracotta decorations of the Doric temple belong to a tradition with its roots in Sicily and Magna Graecia; yet the closest parallels are from Campanian sites like Cumae, Capua and Fratte, in Satricum in Lazio, and Pyrgi in Etruria (D’Agostino in de Waele 2001, 140, D’Alessio 2001, 145-7).

In retrospect, the odd thing is the apparent determination of the scholarship to make the cultural categories of Greek and Etruscan mutually exclusive. Pompeii (like Rome or Lavinium or Satricum) was surely a settlement based on the local population, which we can call for convenience Oscan; there is no sign it was a colony with an implanted population. On the other hand, it came within a strong Etruscan sphere of influence, and for a good deal longer than the half-century Maiuri allowed, and simultaneously under a strong Greek cultural influence, exactly as did the cities of Etruria itself, and those of Latium which were also under Etruscan political influence. This is not a form of cultural schizophrenia, but a direct outcome of its role as a hinge: the port which connects directly with the Greeks of the Naples area and the south of Italy, and which links inland to Nuceria and other non-Greek settlements. Its position allowed it to play a key role in the complex and ambiguous negotiation between Greek and local. The key feature of its material culture is its ambivalence: the temples could be Greek, or could be Etruscan, but are neither fully the one or the other because they constitute a negotiation between the two.

I want to say exactly the same of the town-plan. The grid layout, which emerged in successive phases, has variously been attributed to Greeks, Etruscans and Samnites. Our own excavations in the south-east of the city established that there were sixth-century buildings which respected the later grid layout. I suggested back in 1999 that this raised the possibility that the entire grid layout of the city went back to the sixth century, and pointed out that too few subsurface excavations had been carried out to contradict or confirm the hypothesis (Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill 1999). Since then, at least 3 cases have emerged of sixth-century structures conforming to the grid layout. And though Guzzo remains sceptical, on the grounds that the evidence is inadequate, I continue to think this is a hypothesis worth entertaining (Guzzo 2007, 47-52). But if the grid layout is indeed sixth century, that merely places Pompeii in line with other non-Greek sites, like Marzabotto, which imitated the Greek colonial model. Early Pompeii, in a word, built its cultural identity not by seeking to differentiate itself from Greek neighbours, but by learning their cultural languages, and did so, in all likelihood, because the Etruscans encouraged them to do so by their own example.

As a final example of this cultural negotiation, I offer a fragment of pottery that emerged in the archaic levels of our excavations in the house of Amarantus (Rendeli, in Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill 1999, 82-4). The sherd is from a fifth century Attic amphora body. The graffito is in retrograde Etruscan script. Its function is as an address label, presumably to a local trader: the name, Pape Sa(vfi) has the gentilicium of a well-known Oscan family, Papius, followed by a name which, if the parallel from nearby Vico Equense holds, indicates 'Samnite' (cf. Safinim). This type of

cultural triangulation, between local, Greek and Etruscan, is not, I suggest, merely casual, but a fundamental feature of Pompeian identity.

### **Hellenistic Pompeii**

I fast forward now from c.500 BC to the mid-second century Pompeii which shows numerous signs of economic prosperity in the generations before the Social War. This period has long enjoyed a sort of double characterisation: from the ethnic point of view, it is seen as Samnite or Oscan, from the art-historical as ‘Hellenistic’. So Mau in 1908:

es gehört seiner Entwicklungsstufe nach entschieden dem Hellenismus, der Zeit nach Alexander d.Gr. an. Die Tuffperiode ist kunstgeschichtlich der Hellenismus in Pompeji, politisch die Zeit der Samniten seit ihrer Hellenisierung; sie endet mit der Gründung der römischen Kolonie. (Mau 1908, 39).

The 1920s and 1930s saw the monumental volumes of *Die hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji* by Erich Pernice. One of the most influential, if briefest, contributions along these lines was Hans Lauter’s contribution to the 1975 *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji* volume, entitled, ‘Zur Siedlungsstruktur Pompejis in samnitischer Zeit’, which rightly underlined the building boom of this period and its importance in shaping the town. From the outset, he identifies Samnite as Hellenistic:

Pompejis samnitische Zeit, die im wesentlichen mit der hellenistischen Epoche zusammenfällt...

This Tendenz reached its finest recent expression at the hands of Paul Zanker, the champion of Hellenismus in Mittelitalien, in his fine 1987 essay, ‘Pompeji: Stadtbilder als Spiegel von Gesellschaft und Herrschaftsform’, subsequently translated and transformed into a book in Italian and English, each with interesting variants. Dividing the changing urban image of the town into a series of time-slices, he entitled our period in the original German, ‘die hellenistische Stadt der zweiten Jahrhunderts v.Chr.’, though the 1998 English translation restores a bit of ethnicity by calling the chapter, ‘The Hellenistic City of the Oscans’.

‘Hellenistic’ is one of those categories which are particularly risky to invoke if you are not aware of its ideological presuppositions. J.G. Droysen coined the term to characterise a particular epoch, from Alexander to (more or less) Augustus on the premise that there was a broad cultural movement which gave some sort of Mediterranean-wide coherence to the period, a *Verschmelzung* or fusion of Greek with Oriental culture (see Momigliano 1977, Bichler 1983). He was, as Luciano Canfora (1987) showed, influenced by Niebuhr, who in turn was influenced by the Danish ethnographer

Father Carsten, who studied cultural fusion in the colonialist situation of the west Indies, and specifically Creole languages and cultures. Droysen's 'Hellenismus' is a sort of creolisation of Greek culture, fused with the Oriental. The most perverse thing about this construct is the violence it does to the Greek usage of 'hellenismos' and 'hellenizein', which invariably refer to the insistence on pure Greek in foreign contexts: the anxiety of the grammarian is that Jews, Egyptians, Syrians or Carthaginians should speak an uncontaminated language, the very opposite of the fusion which Droysen posited.

It may seem safe to speak of 'hellenism' in a neutral sort of way simply to refer to the cultural *koine* that we can recognise both in the Greek eastern Mediterranean and in the Roman west: but that is the product not of Greek/Oriental fusion, but of Roman conquest. Unconsciously, Orientalism lurks in the background. Take Paul Zanker's discussion of the figured capitals from the Casa dei Capitelli Figurati. One shows the owner and his wife, while a second capital shows a drunken satyr and a maenad.

The men are naked to the waist, the women swathed in the usual modest robes, but their expressions and embrace make it clear that here, too, they are enjoying wine and an amorous encounter. Through this juxtaposition the owner announces in the most explicit manner his identification with the Dionysiac, hedonistic lifestyle celebrated by Oriental monarchs and characteristic of contemporary Greek cities. The portal thus proclaims his adoption of a specific form of Greek culture. (Zanker 1998, 37)

The entire rhetoric of Asianic luxury and excess, with its roots in fifth-century Athenian writing, and cheerfully recycled by the Romans of Cicero's generation, underpins the characterisation of the 'hellenistic'. It is remarkable how tenacious is the assumption, even by someone so sophisticated as Zanker, that the Dionysiac is somehow 'Oriental', when it is obviously nothing of the sort, and a persistent characteristic of Greek art and culture at all periods.

For Zanker, the Oscans are enthusiastic newcomers to hellenistic culture:

In the case of the palatial tufa houses of the second century B.C., by contrast, the proportions had been correct. The Oscan landowners and merchants who built them were newcomers to Hellenistic culture, but nonetheless full participants in it, indistinguishable from the Greeks of the mother country and Asia Minor except perhaps for a slight degree of excess. When their successors began taking the great Roman aristocrats' villas as their point of orientation, however, Pompeii lapsed into cultural provincialism. (Zanker 1998, 75)



That is to say, the Oscans of the second century were discovering Greek culture for the first time, despite living in a city which for a good five centuries had been in close contact with the Greek cities of the Bay of Naples; and their contact with the hellenistic east was unmediated by contact with the Romans, in spite of the fact that it was with Roman armies that they went east to fight as *socii*, and in the wake of Roman conquest that they operated as *negotiatores*. This is, I submit, purest fantasy; and it is not difficult to replace it with a picture of a Pompeian cultural negotiation which is astonishingly similar to that of the archaic period, except that now the Romans, rather than the Etruscans, are the central Italian power with which they must do business. Cultural identity is not just about who you are, but who you do business with: the Pompeian necessarily did business with the Greek world of South Italy, with the Oscan-speaking world of central Italy and Samnium, and the the Latin-speaking world of Rome. We could ask for no better symbol of this triangulation than the dedication to Mummius in the temple of Apollo that was revealed from its plaster by Andrea Martelli (Martelli 2002, cf. Yarrow 2006). The Oscan lettering and name forms are coherent with the overwhelming use of Oscan in public inscriptions in Pompeii in the second century, and with an implicit association with the Oscan-speakers of the interior. The celebration of the conqueror of Achaëa spells out Pompeii's role as an ally of Rome in the eastern campaigns, from whose booty they were benefiting; while the location of the temple of Apollo, which is rebuilt at this time in the finely cut tufo of the Hellenistic Tuffperiode, decorated with bronze statues of Apollo and Artemis that might themselves be part of the loot of Corinth, point not to a first encounter with hellenistic culture (Achaëa, after all, is scarcely eastern), but to the potential of war booty to update and embellish a sanctuary that had from the first made an engagement with the Greeks explicit.

Maybe, in thinking of the Hellenistic in Italy, we should wean ourselves from the Droysenian obsession with the Oriental, and focus a bit more on the western Mediterranean, and in particular on its Punic cultural background. If you want a snapshot of what Pompeii's Mediterranean-wide links looked like in the pre-imperial period, you need look no further than its coinage. Clive Stannard, who started by analysing for me the 180 or so coins found in our excavations in Reg I ins 9, then compared our sample to other finds in Pompeii, Gragnano and (more dubiously) large numbers of finds by metal detector from the Liri river around Minturno (Stannard 2005). The distribution pattern that comes out, subsequently confirmed by Richard Abdy's study of the larger sample from the Anglo-American project, is strikingly consistent: a good number of local Campanian mintages, especially Naples itself; a certain number of South Italian, Sicilian and Punic issues; a substantial presence from Massilia; a massive presence of the extraordinary small bronzes pieces of Ebusus

(Ibiza), with the type of the Punic god Bes; and a tiny handful from the eastern Mediterranean. That is to say, not totally surprisingly, Pompeii looks west more than east, links to the Greek cities of Naples, Marseilles and Palermo more strongly than to central Greece let alone Asia. And it is in this western Mediterranean context that the Punic is a more potent player than the hellenisation model is ever prepared to admit. Piero Guzzo has recently suggested that Ebusus might have played a role analogous to Delos for trade with the western Mediterranean. If so, that ups the chances of a cultural engagement with the Punic.

From this point of view, it is worth thinking again about the typical *facies* of the domestic building of the third and second centuries, what was Mau called the Kalksteinperiode. Its characterising feature was the use of local Sarno travertine (rather than limestone), both in ashlar blocks, and in the arrangement of chains of alternating vertical and horizontal elements referred to as *opus africanum*. There is a close association between this building technique and plasterwork in the *faux marbre* of the first style, and flooring in *cocciopesto*, with a red background of crushed ceramics, and decoration in its simplest form of rows of white marble chips. The BSR/Reading project met this combination in the house of Amarantus (I.9.12), excavating half a metre below the remodelled *tablinum* with its fourth-style decoration (Wallace-Hadrill 2005, 105). Subsequently, the pattern has been found repeatedly in Filippo Coarelli's ambitious series of excavations focused in the north-west quarter of the town (Reg VI). As his recently published volume, *Rileggere Pompei*, shows in detail, there are two major phases of development (Coarelli and Pesando 2005). The first, broadly in the third century, defines the layout of the house plots, and creates a series of solidly built atrium houses in Sarno stone, with so-called *opus signinum* floors of red cocciopesto with white marble chips, and walls decorated in first or masonry style plaster, typically with yellow socles. The second phase, in the second century, transforms several of the houses, raising them by as much as half a metre, but still uses travertine, cocciopesto and first-style plasterwork. The house of the Centaur is a particularly clear example.

Coarelli's team, in a total of over 80 trenches, have repeatedly found situations which third or early second century structures are buried beneath raised floors with this repetitive typology. This provoked me to wonder about the use of this highly characteristic construction style, which is so widespread in Pompeii, and has such a limited distribution pattern in the Mediterranean, in Punic and Roman north Africa (as its name suggests), in Punic Sicily (Mozia from the 4<sup>th</sup> c, Punic Selinunte, and perhaps above all Solunto), and in Sardinia (e.g. Nora). *Opus africanum* is a rarity in mainland Italy, and far from being a standard Italic building technique. It is therefore with particular

interest that I have learnt from Will Wootton, who has studied the flooring of Euesperides under Andrew Wilson, the importance of Punic flooring in the technology of *cocciopesto* technique as practised in Italy. Part of the story seems to be a Punic obsession with bathing: *cocciopesto* flooring has water-resistant properties, and was much used for bathing facilities, especially at Kerkouane. The route for transmission of these very specific technologies, of wall-construction and flooring, is presumably through Sicily, with surely Panormus as the key point of contact. The link between the Bay of Naples and Palermo has remained historically tenacious, and it makes sense that Pompeii looked in this direction too. If there is a Hellenistic fusion that is reaching Pompeii in the third and early second centuries, it is that of Greek and Punic which characterises Sicily, not the supposed Greek and Oriental of the eastern Mediterranean.

This is not to deny eastern contact, but rather to downdate it. The sack of Corinth does seem to mark a change. The tufo period at Pompeii does seem to belong to one quite specific episode. The distribution of ashlar tufo facades is quite specific and limited. They chase down the via dell'Abbondanza as far as the Stabian baths, chase uphill up the via Stabiana, then head back to the Forum along the via della Fortuna. It is hard to explain such a distribution in terms of mere fashion, and it looks strongly like an act of communal will to renew facades in certain streets to embellish the city. The tufo facades are not integral to the construction of the houses behind them, but stuck on. They climaxed at the top of the via dell'Abbondanza with a monumental gateway of tufo, right opposite the temple of Apollo. It seems to me we are looking at a major urban renewal in the wake of the sack of Corinth.

This timing nicely suits the chronology of the famous 'Hellenistic' house of Pompeii, the house of the Faun. Its tufo façade ties it into this phase of urban embellishment. Its spectacular mosaics point explicitly to the east, to Alexander's campaigns as commemorated, so Bernard Andreae has argued by the Seleucids in Syria, and to Egypt as represented by the Nilotica which in their turn tie in so closely to the late second century monumentalisation of Praeneste. In this context, we may welcome the suggestion, made simultaneously by Fabrizio Pesando (1996) studying the House of the Faun, and by Meyboom (1995) studying the Palestrina mosaic, that the owners of the house were the Satrii, a well-attested family in Oscan areas, and that the choice of the Faun, or rather Satyr, to decorate both their atrium and their master-bedroom, was a play on their name. It is not difficult to imagine a Satrius leading the Pompeian *socii* into some eastern engagement, sacking some innocent centre, and coming back fancying himself a proper Alexander triumphant over the east.

At the entrance to the house of the Faun is a stretch of *cocciopesto* flooring with white marble chips spelling out the Latin greeting, HAVE. This has caused some concern to those who want Oscan to be the only visible language in pre-colonial Pompeii, and Latin to be the exclusive language of the Roman colony. But, as Zevi has argued (1998), there is no need to downdate the inscription to after 80. Latin, of necessity, was the *lingua franca* and the Roman and allied armies; the local elites must have mastered it, and so too might their troops. Public inscriptions were put up in Oscan in Pompeii not for ignorance of Latin, but in awareness of a separate cultural identity that is marked throughout the central Italy in the second century. But to infer from this that they were culturally out of contact with Rome is absurd. Consider only Lisa Fentress's demonstration (2003) that the early second-century House of Diana at Cosa was built to exactly the same ground plan, down to quite small details, as the House of Sallust at Pompeii. We can add that there are many similarities between the row-houses of Cosa, and those studied by Hoffmann and Nappo (1997) at Pompeii. It is no coincidence that Pompeii is the type-site for the Roman atrium house. The Pompeians were building their houses on models familiar in Roman colonies long before they themselves became one, even if they were using building technologies that pointed to the Punic world.

I have underlined the ambivalence of the cultural affinities met in Pompeii. For a final example of how difficult the boundaries are, we may consider the small theatre or Odeion at Pompeii. As is well-known, it is extraordinarily close in design to the theatre at the sanctuary site of Pietrabbondante, that ultimate symbol of Samnite separatism. But it was erected, according to its dedication, by C. Quinctius Valgus and M. Porcius, the same Sullan colonial magistrates who built the amphitheatre, that ultimate symbol of the Roman. The same theatre design, then, might be Samnite in Pietrabbondante, and Roman in Pompeii. But of course it was also potentially Samnite in Pompeii- we cannot exclude that it had been projected before the Social War, and only finished off by the Sullan *duoviri*. And on the other hand, it was also hellenistic, with its elegant sphinx finials and Atlas supports. The design could come from the east. But since the same design was also found at Sarno, the model might be more local, even Capua.

## **Conclusion**

I have taken two moments of Pompeii to tell a similar cultural story. I do not want to make Pompeii too exceptional- similar stories can be told elsewhere- but I do want to make it specific. Its precise location, and the precise conjunctures of the shifting tides of Mediterranean history, enabled Pompeii to communicate with multiple other partners. What is unique about the culture of Pompeii

is the precise sequence of combinations of different cultures it entered contact with at different moments. You can call this a Pompeian fusion if you must, but while I think the elements become confused and intertwined, I am not convinced that it is helpful to speak of fusion, because it constantly underestimates the cultural power of speaking different languages simultaneously, and playing them off against each other.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bichler, R. (1983). *Hellenismus: Geschichte und Problematik eines Epochenbegriffs*
- Briquel, D. (1984). *Les Pélasges en Italie : recherches sur l'histoire de la légende*. Rome : Ecole française
- Canfora, L. (1987). *Ellenismo*. Rome-Bari.
- Carrington, R.C. (1932). 'The Etruscans and Pompeii', *Antiquity* 6: 5-23
- Coarelli, F. (1996). *Revixit Ars. Arte e ideologia a Roma, dai modelli ellenistici alla tradizione repubblicana*. Rome.
- Coarelli, F. and F. Pesando, (eds.) (2005). *Rileggere Pompei I. L'insula 10 della Regio VI*. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 12. Rome.
- Cristofani, M. (1992). 'La fase 'etrusca' di Pompei' in F. Zevi (ed), *Pompei*. Napoli
- D'Alessio, M.T. (2001). *Materiali votivi dal foro triangolare di Pompei*. Rome
- De Caro, S. (1986). *Saggi nell'area del tempio di Apollo a Pompei: scavi stratigrafici di A. Maiuri nel 1931-32 e 1942-43*. Napoli
- De Waele, J.A.K.E. (ed.) (2001). *Il tempio dorico del Foro triangolare di Pompei*. Roma
- Delbrück, R. (1907-1912). *Hellenistische Bauten in Latium*.
- Droysen, J.G. (ed 1 1836, 1843, ed 2 1877-8). *Geschichte des Hellenismus*.
- Fentress, E. (2003). *Cosa V: an intermittent Town, Excavations 1991-1997*. Ann Arbor.
- Fulford, M. G. and A. Wallace-Hadrill (1999). 'Towards a history of pre-Roman Pompeii: excavations beneath the House of Amarantus (I.9.11-12), 1995-8', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 67: 37-144.
- Guzzo, P. G. (2000). 'Alla ricerca della Pompei sannitica', in *Studi sull'Italia dei Sanniti*, ed. R. Cappelli. Rome: 107-117.
- Guzzo, P.G. and Guidobaldi, M.P. (eds) (2005). *Nuove Ricerche Archeologiche a Pompei ed Ercolano*. Napoli
- Guzzo, P.G. (2007). *Pompei. Storia e paesaggi della città antica*. Milano
- Maiuri, A. (1973). *Alla ricerca di Pompei preromana*. Napoli.

- Martelli, A. (2002). 'Per una nuova lettura dell'iscrizione Vetter 61 nel contesto del santuario di Apollo a Pompei', *Eutopia: Rivista di studi sull'Europa antica* II, 2: 71-81.
- Mau, A. (1904). 'Die alte Säule in Pompeji', *Römische Mitteilungen* 19: 124-31
- Meyboom, F. (1995). *The Nile Mosaic of Palestrina. Early Evidence of Egyptian Religion in Italy*. Leiden/New York/Köln.
- Momigliano, A. (1977). 'J.G. Droysen between Jews and Greeks', *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*, 307ff.
- Nappo, S. C. (1997). 'Urban transformation at Pompeii in the late third and early second centuries BC', in *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, ed. R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill. Portsmouth, Rhode Island.
- Pesando, F. (1996). 'Autocelebrazione aristocratica e propaganda politica in ambiente privato: la casa del Fauno a Pompei', *Cahiers du Centre Gustav-Glotz* 7: 189-228.
- Stannard, C. (2005). 'The monetary stock at Pompeii at the turn of the second and first centuries B.C.: Pseudo-Ebusus and Pseudo-Massilia', in Guzzo and Guidobaldi (2005), 120-43
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1997). 'Rethinking the Roman atrium house', in *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, ed. R. Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill. Portsmouth, RI, Supp. 22: 219-40.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2005). 'Excavation and standing structures in Pompeii Insula I.9', in Guzzo and Guidobaldi (2005), 101-108
- Yarrow, L. (2006). 'Lucius Mummius and the spoils of Corinth', *Scripta Classica Israelica*(25): 57-70.
- Zanker P. (ed) (1976). *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien : Kolloquium in Göttingen vom 5. bis 9. Juni 1974*
- Zanker, P. (1987). *Pompeji. Stadtbilder als Spiegel von Gesellschaft und Herrschaftsform*. Mainz
- Zanker, P. (1998). *Pompeii: Public and Private*. Cambridge, MA
- Zevi, F. (1998). 'Die Casa del Fauno in Pompeji und das Alexandermosaik', *Römische Mitteilungen* 105: 21-65.